

Appl. No. 10/787,296
Amendment dated February 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 09 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended to recite clearly that the first location information is determined independently of location information in the second network and the second location information is determined independently of the first location information in the first network. Amendments have been made to claims 1 and 19 along these lines.

The Examiner, in the response to argument section, indicated that

"it is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., no concept of an intersection of two independently defined areas (page 9, paragraph 3)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Respectfully, the Examiner would like to point out to Applicant that the limitation "determining a first location information defining a location of the mobile device in a first network," does not inherently mean the first location information is defined independently."

In a telephone interview between the undersigned and the Examiner, this issue was discussed with an effort to agree upon claim limitations that would give the claims the desired interpretation, namely that the two locations are independently determined and that then an intersection of the two areas is used for paging. It was agreed, at least on a preliminary basis, that the amendments to the claims should result in their being given this interpretation.

Having made this amendment, the arguments presented in the previous response now should read more clearly upon the claim language.

Having made these amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to refer to the previous response where the arguments for the patentability of the claims over Silver are clearly set out. On this basis the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3 to 9, 11 to 15 and 19 to 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Appl. No. 10/787,296
Amdmt dated February 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2006

All of the other rejections are 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections that combine Silver with one or more other references. It is respectfully submitted that all of these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons presented above. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ARUN MUNJE

By



Allan Brett

Reg. No. 40,476

Tel.: (613) 232-2486 ext. 323

Date: February 9, 2007

RAB:rlid